

Categorical Exclusion Documentation
Carioca Co./Shimbala Properties Assignment
DOI-BLM-P010-2013-0007-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: *Hassayampa Field Office (HFO)*

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: AZA-29089

Proposed Action Title/Type: Right-of-Way Assignment from Shimbala Properties to the Carioca Co.

Location of Proposed Action: T. 7 N., R. 2 E., G&SRM, Arizona
Section 34, part of NE¼NW¼.

Description of Proposed Action: The assignment of an existing right-of-way (R/W) from Shimbala Properties to the Carioca Co. The purpose of the R/W is for water retention area.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: The Bradshaw-Harquahala Resource Management Plan (RMP). This proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with these plans (43 CFR 1610.5-3, BLM Manual 1601.04.C.2) Date Approved: April 2010

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

X The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions): Specifically, in the Bradshaw-Harquahala Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP), page 33, under Land Use Authorizations, LR-25 states, "Continue to issue land use authorizations (rights-of-way, leases, permits, easements) on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with resource management prescriptions in this land use plan."

C: Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 2, Appendix 1, or 516 DM 11.5: *E. (9) "Renewals and assignments of leases, permits or rights-of-way where no additional rights are conveyed beyond those granted in the original authorizations".*

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 or 516 DM 11.5 apply.

D: Signature

Authorizing Official: _____/S/_____ Date: 11/29/2012

D. Remington Hawes
Field Manager, HFO

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:
Jim Andersen (623-580-5570) jvanders@blm.gov

BLM Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances¹ Attachment 1

The action has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances (43 CFR 46.215) apply. The project would:		
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness or wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (Executive Order 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:

7. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the Bureau or office?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners, or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:

**Approval and Decision
Attachment 2**

Compliance and assignment of responsibility: Jim Andersen

Monitoring and assignment of responsibility: Jim Andersen

Review: *We have determined that the proposal is in accordance with the categorical exclusion criteria and that it would not involve any significant environmental effects. Therefore, it is categorically excluded from further environmental review.*

Prepared by: _____/S/_____ **Date::** ____11/29/12__

Jim Andersen
Project Lead

Reviewed by: _____/S/_____ **Date::** ____11/29/12__

James Ingram
Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Reviewed by: _____/S/_____ **Date:** ____11/29/12__

D. Remington Hawes
Manager

Project Description:

The assignment of an existing right-of-way (R/W) from Shimbala Properties to the Carioca Co. The purpose of the R/W is for water retention area.

Decision: Based on a review of the project described above and field office staff recommendations, I have determined that the project is in conformance with the land use plan and is categorically excluded from further environmental analysis. It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the mitigating measures/stipulations attached to the original grant.

Approved By: _____/S/_____ **Date:** _11/29/2012__

D. Remington Hawes, Field Manager, HFO